IBM CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT
11400 BURNET ROAD
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78758
FAX # 512

DATE: 01/02/06

Number of Pages to Follow (including cover sheet) 16

SEND TO: United States Patent Office

Examiner: Sara M. Haune

Group Art Unit: 2179

Tel No: [redacted] 703-305-0703

Fax #: 571-273-8300

FROM: J.B. KRAFT

Tel No: 512-473-2303

Docket No. AUS920010907US1 Serial No. 10/047,116 Atty: J.B.KRAFT

Applicants: C. N. Ullmann et al

___ Transmittal Letter (2 copies)	___ Certificate of Facsimile
___ Preliminary Amendment	___ Notice of Appeal
___ Amendment AF	___ Appeal Brief (3 copies)
___ Ext. of Time	✓ Reply Brief (3 copies)
___ IDS Statement	___ Change of Address
___ Other	

Deposit Acct. No. 09-0447

Fees: Amendment _____ Notice of Appeal _____ Appeal Brief _____ Other

PATENT
10/047,116

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:	:	Group Art Unit: 2179
	:	Examiner: Sara M. Hanne
Cristi N. Ullmann et al.	:	Intellectual Property
Serial No: 10/047,116	:	Law Department - 4054
Filed: 01/15/2002	:	International Business
Title: A SYSTEM FOR	:	Machines Corporation
RECORDING WORLD WIDE WEB	:	11400 Burnet Road
BROWSING SESSIONS NAVIGATION	:	Austin, Texas 78758
ON A REAL-TIME BASIS AND FOR	:	Customer No. 32,329
SUBSEQUENTLY DISPLAYING THE	:	
RECORDED SESSIONS AS	:	
SURROGATE BROWSING SESSIONS	:	
WITH USER ENABLED REAL-TIME	:	
MODIFICATION	:	
Dated: 1/2/06	:	

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence including the present Reply Brief (in triplicate) is being transmitted via facsimile to USPTO, Group Art Unit 2179 at telephone number 571-273-8300, and to the attention of Examiner Sara M. Hanne on 1/2/06

J.B. KRAFT

REPLY BRIEF ON APPEAL
BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Commissioner for Patents
P.O.Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a Reply Brief to the Examiner's Answer mailed November 2, 2005.

In the Answer, the Examiner makes one new argument and cites specific sections in a modifying reference, Scherphier (US5,944,791) which Applicants need to address.

However, before proceeding further, Applicants wish to again summarize the claimed invention, and the differences from the teaching of the basic Rust patent.

According to both Rust and the present invention, the browsing sessions are recorded on a real time basis and may played back at the same pace as recorded or at a different pace. However, the present invention differs from the teaching of Rust in one major aspect: hyperlinks which were recorded and saved but never selected or clicked on during the original recorded browsing sessions are available and may be subsequently interactively selected by the subsequent user during the playback sessions to access and display the linked Web document.

There is nothing in the Rust teaching which suggests that during a subsequent playback session, there can be an interactive selecting of an unselected unused hyperlink from the previously recorded Web browsing session to thereby access the linked hypertext (Web) document. The Examiner admits that Rust explicitly fails to set forth "the subsequent user selecting a recorded but previously unselected hyperlink" (commencing with last full sentence on page 3 of final rejection). The Examiner who has failed to find anything in Rust suggestive of this inventive point, goes on to argue merely that whether or not a hyperlink is previously selected or unselected is of little consequence to the subsequent user.

The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to select in a subsequent playback

previously unselected hyperlink. What the Examiner has ignored is that in Rust, there is no embodiment which would permit a user to interactively click on or select a previously unselected hyperlink. The whole purpose of Rust is to present to subsequent viewers, a playback of the recorded collaborative Web browsing session which is not interactive i.e. the viewer can not select an unselected hyperlink by pointing and clicking. Reference is made to the primary Fig. 1A in Rust, in which the collaborative Web browsing session is interactively created by presenter and attendee clients, then correlated and recorded with the audio and visual components of the collaborative web browsing session at control server 140. Then, it is made available for subsequent playback to the Playback Client 150. The stated purpose of Rust, (lines 42-52), column 2, is to provide a means of briefing a future or absentee customer (Playback Client 150) of the presentation of a collaborative browsing session, and not to provide to provide the customer with the interactive means for subsequently participating in the session,

In the Answer, the Examiner argues that it is known that individual Web documents may be recorded with active hyperlinks therein. With such a non-specific vague general statement, it is difficult for Applicants to respond to how this could suggest a modification in the fixed playback with integrated recorded audio and visual components provide in Rust to future Playback Client 150.

In this connection, Examiner makes an argument in the Answer involving the Scherphier Patent (US5,944,791) cross-referenced in Rust. In Scherphier, there is described a collaborative Web browsing session, in which the controlling computer, which chooses the hyperlinks, is represented as the "Pilot Computer", and the other computers in the session

as "Passenger Computers". Examiner notes that there is provision in Scherphier for promoting a Passenger Computer to a Co-Pilot Computer which can now chose hyperlinks in Web pages in the browsing session. Examiner feels that this would somehow suggest that Rust's Playback Client 150 could also be given such a function.

Applicants submit that the Passenger Computer in Scherphier promoted to Co-Pilot is not a subsequent viewer of the recorded collaborative browsing session. The Co-pilot computer is only a participant in the on-going collaborative session which is promoted so that the co-pilot could now also control the ongoing collaborative browsing session.

Ther is one last point in the Answer which Applicants need to address. In the middle paragraph on page 8 of the Answer, Examiner argues that Applicants can not incorporate their "Later Link Log" embodiment example into the claims in order to establish patentability over the cited prior art. This is not Applicants intention. The present claims stand on their own as unobvious over the prior art.

The purpose of Applicants' citing of their "Later Link Log" embodiment was to show that unlike the present invention, the Rust reference is completely lacking in any embodiment or suggestion of how hyperlinks could be preserved as active in subsequent play back of recorded Web browsing sessions.

Accordingly, for the above reasons and for the reasons set forth in the Brief on Appeal, it is respectfully requested that the Final Rejection be reversed, and that claims 1-28, all of the claims in the present patent application be found to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted

J.B. 1/2/06

J. B. Kraft
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 19,226
(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Mark Walker
IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, Texas 78758

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 02 2006

PATENT
10/047,116

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Cristi N. Ullmann et al.
Serial No: 10/047,116
Filed: 01/15/2002
Title: A SYSTEM FOR RECORDING WORLD WIDE WEB BROWSING SESSIONS NAVIGATION ON A REAL-TIME BASIS AND FOR SUBSEQUENTLY DISPLAYING THE RECORDED SESSIONS AS SURROGATE BROWSING SESSIONS WITH USER ENABLED REAL-TIME MODIFICATION
Dated: 1/2/06

Group Art Unit: 2179
Examiner: Sara M. Hanne
Intellectual Property
Law Department - 4054
International Business
Machines Corporation
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, Texas 78758
Customer No. 32,329

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence including the present Reply Brief (in triplicate) is being transmitted via facsimile to USPTO, Group Art Unit 2179 at telephone number 571-273-8300, and to the attention of Examiner Sara M. Hanne on 1/2/06

J.B. KRAFT

REPLY BRIEF ON APPEAL
BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Commissioner for Patents
P.O.Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

AUS920010907US1

This is a Reply Brief to the Examiner's Answer mailed November 2, 2005.

In the Answer, the Examiner makes one new argument and cites specific sections in a modifying reference, Scherphier (US5,944,791) which Applicants need to address.

However, before proceeding further, Applicants wish to again summarize the claimed invention, and the differences from the teaching of the basic Rust patent.

According to both Rust and the present invention, the browsing sessions are recorded on a real time basis and may played back at the same pace as recorded or at a different pace. However, the present invention differs from the teaching of Rust in one major aspect: hyperlinks which were recorded and saved but never selected or clicked on during the original recorded browsing sessions are available and may be subsequently interactively selected by the subsequent user during the playback sessions to access and display the linked Web document.

There is nothing in the Rust teaching which suggests that during a subsequent playback session, there can be an interactive selecting of an unselected unused hyperlink from the previously recorded Web browsing session to thereby access the linked hypertext (Web) document. The Examiner admits that Rust explicitly fails to set forth "the subsequent user selecting a recorded but previously unselected hyperlink" (commencing with last full sentence on page 3 of final rejection). The Examiner who has failed to find anything in Rust suggestive of this inventive point, goes on to argue merely that whether or not a hyperlink is previously selected or unselected is of little consequence to the subsequent user.

The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to select in a subsequent playback

a previously unselected hyperlink. What the Examiner has ignored is that in Rust, there is no embodiment which would permit a user to interactively click on or select a previously unselected hyperlink. The whole purpose of Rust is to present to subsequent viewers, a playback of the recorded collaborative Web browsing session which is not interactive i.e. the viewer can not select an unselected hyperlink by pointing and clicking. Reference is made to the primary Fig. 1A in Rust, in which the collaborative Web browsing session is interactively created by presenter and attendee clients, then correlated and recorded with the audio and visual components of the collaborative web browsing session at control server 140. Then, it is made available for subsequent playback to the Playback Client 150. The stated purpose of Rust, (lines 42-52), column 2, is to provide a means of briefing a future or absentee customer (Playback Client 150) of the presentation of a collaborative browsing session, and not to provide to provide the customer with the interactive means for subsequently participating in the session.

In the Answer, the Examiner argues that it is known that individual Web documents may be recorded with active hyperlinks therein. With such a non-specific vague general statement, it is difficult for Applicants to respond to how this could suggest a modification in the fixed playback with integrated recorded audio and visual components provide in Rust to future Playback Client 150.

In this connection, Examiner makes an argument in the Answer involving the Scherphier Patent (US5,944,791), cross-referenced in Rust. In Scherphier, there is described a collaborative Web browsing session, in which the controlling computer, which chooses the hyperlinks, is represented as the "Pilot Computer", and the other computers in the session

as "Passenger Computers". Examiner notes that there is provision in Scherphier for promoting a Passenger Computer to a Co-Pilot Computer which can now chose hyperlinks in Web pages in the browsing session. Examiner feels that this would somehow suggest that Rust's Playback Client 150 could also be given such a function.

Applicants submit that the Passenger Computer in Scherphier promoted to Co-Pilot is not a subsequent viewer of the recorded collaborative browsing session. The Co-pilot computer is only a participant in the on-going collaborative session which is promoted so that the Co-pilot could now also control the ongoing collaborative browsing session.

Ther is one last point in the Answer which Applicants need to address. In the middle paragraph on page 8 of the Answer, Examiner argues that Applicants can not incorporate their "Later Link Log" embodiment example into the claims in order to establish patentability over the cited prior art. This is not Applicants intention. The present claims stand on their own as unobvious over the prior art.

The purpose of Applicants' citing of their "Later Link Log" embodiment was to show that unlike the present invention, the Rust reference is completely lacking in any embodiment or suggestion of how hyperlinks could be preserved as active in subsequent play back of recorded Web browsing sessions.

Accordingly, for the above reasons and for the reasons set forth in the Brief on Appeal, it is respectfully requested that the Final Rejection be reversed, and that claims 1-28, all of the claims in the present patent application be found to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted

J. B. Kraft 1/2/06

J. B. Kraft
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 19,226
(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Mark Walker
IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, Texas 78758

PATENT
10/047,116

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:	Group Art Unit: 2179
	Examiner: Sara M. Hanne
Cristi N. Ullmann et al.	Intellectual Property
Serial No: 10/047,116	Law Department - 4054
Filed: 01/15/2002	International Business
Title: A SYSTEM FOR RECORDING WORLD WIDE WEB BROWSING SESSIONS NAVIGATION ON A REAL-TIME BASIS AND FOR SUBSEQUENTLY DISPLAYING THE RECORDED SESSIONS AS SURROGATE BROWSING SESSIONS WITH USER ENABLED REAL-TIME MODIFICATION	Machines Corporation
	11400 Burnet Road
	Austin, Texas 78758
	Customer No. 32,329
Dated: 1/2/06	

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence including the present Reply Brief (in triplicate) is being transmitted via facsimile to USPTO, Group Art Unit 2179 at telephone number 571-273-8300, and to the attention of Examiner Sara M. Hanne on 1/2/06.

J.B. KRAFT

REPLY BRIEF ON APPEAL
BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Commissioner for Patents
P.O.Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

AUS920010907US1

This is a Reply Brief to the Examiner's Answer mailed November 2, 2005.

In the Answer, the Examiner makes one new argument and cites specific sections in a modifying reference, Scherpbier (US5,944,791) which Applicants need to address.

However, before proceeding further, Applicants wish to again summarize the claimed invention, and the differences from the teaching of the basic Rust patent.

According to both Rust and the present invention, the browsing sessions are recorded on a real time basis and may played back at the same pace as recorded or at a different pace. However, the present invention differs from the teaching of Rust in one major aspect: hyperlinks which were recorded and saved but never selected or clicked on during the original recorded browsing sessions are available and may be subsequently interactively selected by the subsequent user during the playback sessions to access and display the linked Web document.

There is nothing in the Rust teaching which suggests that during a subsequent playback session, there can be an interactive selecting of an unselected unused hyperlink from the previously recorded Web browsing session to thereby access the linked hypertext (Web) document. The Examiner admits that Rust explicitly fails to set forth "the subsequent user selecting a recorded but previously unselected hyperlink" (commencing with last full sentence on page 3 of final rejection). The Examiner who has failed to find anything in Rust suggestive of this inventive point, goes on to argue merely that whether or not a hyperlink is previously selected or unselected is of little consequence to the subsequent user.

The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to select in a subsequent playback

a previously unselected hyperlink. What the Examiner has ignored is that in Rust, there is no embodiment which would permit a user to interactively click on or select a previously unselected hyperlink. The whole purpose of Rust is to present to subsequent viewers, a playback of the recorded collaborative Web browsing session which is not interactive i.e. the viewer can not select an unselected hyperlink by pointing and clicking. Reference is made to the primary Fig. 1A in Rust, in which the collaborative Web browsing session is interactively created by presenter and attendee clients, then correlated and recorded with the audio and visual components of the collaborative web browsing session at control server 140. Then, it is made available for subsequent playback to the Playback Client 150. The stated purpose of Rust, (lines 42-52), column 2, is to provide a means of briefing a future or absentee customer (Playback Client 150) of the presentation of a collaborative browsing session, and not to provide to provide the customer with the interactive means for subsequently participating in the session,

In the Answer, the Examiner argues that it is known that individual Web documents may be recorded with active hyperlinks therein. With such a non-specific vague general statement, it is difficult for Applicants to respond to how this could suggest a modification in the fixed playback with integrated recorded audio and visual components provide in Rust to future Playback Client 150.

In this connection, Examiner makes an argument in the Answer involving the Scherphier Patent (US5,944,791), cross-referenced in Rust. In Scherphier, there is described a collaborative Web browsing session, in which the controlling computer, which chooses the hyperlinks, is represented as the "Pilot Computer", and the other computers in the session

as "Passenger Computers". Examiner notes that there is provision in Scherphier for promoting a Passenger Computer to a Co-Pilot Computer which can now chose hyperlinks in Web pages in the browsing session. Examiner feels that this would somehow suggest that Rust's Playback Client 150 could also be given such a function.

Applicants submit that the Passenger Computer in Scherphier promoted to Co-Pilot is not a subsequent viewer of the recorded collaborative browsing session. The Co-pilot computer is only a participant in the on-going collaborative session which is promoted so that the Co-pilot could now also control the ongoing collaborative browsing session.

Ther is one last point in the Answer which Applicants need to address. In the middle paragraph on page 8 of the Answer, Examiner argues that Applicants can not incorporate their "Later Link Log" embodiment example into the claims in order to establish patentability over the cited prior art. This is not Applicants intention. The present claims stand on their own as unobvious over the prior art.

The purpose of Applicants' citing of their "Later Link Log" embodiment was to show that unlike the present invention, the Rust reference is completely lacking in any embodiment or suggestion of how hyperlinks could be preserved as active in subsequent play back of recorded Web browsing sessions.

Accordingly, for the above reasons and for the reasons set forth in the Brief on Appeal, it is respectfully requested that the Final Rejection be reversed, and that claims 1-28, all of the claims in the present patent application be found to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted

J. B. Kraft 1/2/06

J. B. Kraft
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 19,226
(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Mark Walker
IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, Texas 78758